



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/595,891

05/18/2006

Dominique Jean-Pierre Mabire

PRD-2120USPCT

8597

27777 7590 04/29/2009
PHILIP S. JOHNSON
JOHNSON & JOHNSON
ONE JOHNSON & JOHNSON PLAZA
NEW BRUNSWICK, NJ 08933-7003

EXAMINER

MCDOWELL, BRIAN E

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1624

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

04/29/2009

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/595,891	Applicant(s) MABIRE ET AL.	
	Examiner BRIAN MCDOWELL	Art Unit 1624	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 3/30/2009.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 17-22 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 17-22 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

/BEM/

DETAILED ACTION

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 3/30/2009 has been entered.

Status of Claims

Claims 17-22 are pending in the instant application.

Status of Rejections

35 USC § 112 (2nd Paragraph)

Applicant's amendment of claims 18 and 19 (in reference to the indefinite rejection of claims 18 and 19) see Remarks, filed 3/30/2009, with respect to the Final Office Action mailed 12/31/2008, has been fully considered and the rejection has been overcome.

Double Patenting

The double patenting rejection of claims 17-22 is still maintained.

Applicant's remarks of claims 17-22 (in reference to the double patenting rejection of claims 17-22) see Remarks, filed 3/30/2009, with respect to the Final Office Action mailed 12/31/2008, have been noted and the rejection is maintained.

35 USC § 103

Applicant's arguments of claims 17, 18, and 21 (in reference to the 103 rejection of said claims) see Remarks, filed 3/30/2009, with respect to the Final Office Action mailed 12/31/2008, have been fully considered and the rejection has been overcome.

35 USC § 112

The 112 rejection is still maintained.

Applicant's amendment of claim 22 (in reference to the 112 rejection of said claim) see Remarks, filed 3/30/2009, with respect to the Final Office Action mailed 12/31/2008, has been fully considered but is not found persuasive.

Art Unit: 1624

The instant disclosure is still not enabled with respect to obtaining any combination of a compound that comprises the compounds of the present invention along with the chemotherapeutic agents listed in claim 22. Applicant is reminded of the Wands factors:

- (A) The breadth of the claims;
- (B) The nature of the invention;
- (C) The state of the prior art;
- (D) The level of one of ordinary skill;
- (E) The level of predictability in the art;
- (F) The amount of direction provided by the inventor;
- (G) The existence of working examples; and
- (H) The quantity of experimentation needed to make or use the invention based on the content of the disclosure.

In particular, applicant should note factors (E) and (G). In reference to unpredictability in the art, Borisy *et al.* (Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U S A.) describes that combining multicomponent therapies (i.e., combining two therapeutic drugs) would not necessarily give a synergistic result, thus the art is highly unpredictable (see discussions section, page 7982). Additionally, applicant has not shown how one of ordinary skill would be able to make and use the combinations recited in claim 22 (lack of working examples). Therefore, the claim is not enabled.

New Objections and Rejections

Claim 19 is objected to because of the following informalities: Claim 19 currently reads “wherein –Z is a heterocyclic ring system selected from (c-1)”. It

Art Unit: 1624

should more appropriately read "Z is a heterocyclic ring system selected from (c-1)". Appropriate correction is required.

Claim 20 should more appropriately read as "A compound selected from the group consisting of:" or similar language.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112 (1st Paragraph)

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 17, 21, and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, because the specification, while being enabling for compounds and/or compositions where R¹ is C₁₋₆alkyl, does not reasonably provide enablement for the other thousands of compounds that applicant is claiming. The specification does not enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make the invention commensurate in scope with these claims.

Pursuant to *In re Wands*, 858 F.2d 731,737, 8 USPQ2d 1400, 1404 (Fed. Cir. 1988), one considers the following factors to determine whether undue experimentation is required:

- (A) The breadth of the claims;
- (B) The nature of the invention;

(C) The state of the prior art;
(D) The level of one of ordinary skill;
(E) The level of predictability in the art;
(F) The amount of direction provided by the inventor;
(G) The existence of working examples; and
(H) The quantity of experimentation needed to make or use the invention based on the content of the disclosure.

Some experimentation is not fatal; the issue is whether the amount of experimentation is "undue"; see *In re Vaeck*, 20 USPQ2d 1438, 1444. Analysis is described below:

(A) Breadth of claims: The formula I is drawn to a myriad of substituents that vary independently and lead to compounds of a wide variety of structures. These compounds encompass molecules that widely vary in the physical and chemical properties such as size, molecular weight, acidity, basicity, and properties that are known in the art to greatly influence pharmacokinetic and pharmacodynamic parameters, not to mention the ability to productively bind to claimed biological target molecules. The claims cover compounds easily in the millions given the number of possible rings, ring systems covered by the claims' scope along with varying choices for remaining variables; thus the claims are very broad.

(B) The nature of the invention: 2-quinoxalinones and 2-quinolinones as poly(ADP-ribose)polymerase-1 inhibitors.

(C) State of the Prior Art: Chemistry is unpredictable. See *In Re Marzocchi and Horton* 169 USPQ at 367 paragraph 3:

Art Unit: 1624

"Most non-chemists would probably be horrified if they were to learn how many attempted syntheses fail, and how inefficient research chemists are. The ratio of successful to unsuccessful chemical experiments in a normal research laboratory is far below unity, and synthetic research chemists, in the same way as most scientists, spend most of their time working out what went wrong, and why. Despite the many pitfalls lurking in organic synthesis, most organic chemistry textbooks and research articles do give the impression that organic reactions just proceed smoothly and that the total synthesis of complex natural products, for instance, is maybe a labor-intensive but otherwise undemanding task.

In fact, most syntheses of structurally complex natural products are the result of several years of hard work by a team of chemists, with almost every step requiring careful optimization. The final synthesis usually looks quite different from that originally planned, because of unexpected difficulties encountered in the initially chosen synthetic sequence. Only the seasoned practitioner who has experienced for himself the many failures and frustrations which the development (sometimes even the repetition) of a synthesis usually implies will be able to appraise such workChemists tend not to publish negative results, because these are, as opposed to positive results, never definite (and far too copious)" Dorwald F. A. Side Reactions in Organic Synthesis, 2005, Wiley: VCH, Weinheim pg. IX of Preface.

(D) Skill of those in the art: The level of skill in the art is high.

(E) Level of predictability in the art: It is well established that "the scope of enablement varies inversely with the degree of unpredictability of the factors involved," and physiological activity is generally considered to be an unpredictable factor. See *In re Fisher*, 427 F.2d 833, 839, 166 USPQ 18, 24 (CCPA 1970).

(F) Direction or Guidance: Little guidance or direction is provided by applicant in reference to making compounds where R₁ is other than C₁₋₆alkyl. The presence

Art Unit: 1624

of various bulky heterocyclic or carbocyclic rings attached to the compound's core may be chemically incompatible with the method of use embraced in the instant claims. Specification offers no teachings or suggestion as to how to make and use these compounds. Also, note MPEP 2164.08(b) which states that claims that read on "... significant numbers of inoperative embodiments would render claims nonenabled when the specification does not clearly identify the operative embodiments and undue experimentation is involved in determining those that are operative.";

(G) Working Examples: The compound core depicted with specific substituents represent a narrow subgenus for which applicant has provided sufficient guidance to make and use; however, this disclosure is not sufficient to allow extrapolation of the limited examples to enable the scope of the compounds instantly claimed. Applicant has provided no working examples of any compounds where the compound of formula I did not contain the variables previously mentioned above in the present application.

The specification gives some *in vitro* test results on PARP-1 inhibitory activity of a limited number of preferable compounds, however it is too homogeneous to provide a clear evaluation of which moieties attached to the compound's core out of the many claimed might affect potency to a large or small degree. The pharmaceutical art is unpredictable and target compounds need to be individually assessed for viability. Extremely broad generalizations as found in the instant claims are in contradiction with the basis of quantitative structure-activity-relationship (QSAR).

Art Unit: 1624

Within the specification, "specific operative embodiments or examples of the invention must be set forth. Examples and description should be of sufficient scope as to justify the scope of the claims. *Markush* claims must be provided with support in the disclosure for each member of the *Markush* group. Where the constitution and formula of a chemical compound is stated only as a probability or speculation, the disclosure is not sufficient to support claims identifying the compound by such composition or formula." See MPEP 608.01(p).

(H) The quantity of experimentation needed: Since there are very limited working examples as described above, the amount of experimentation is expected to be high and burdensome. Applicant fails to provide guidance and supporting information for how to make and/or use the thousands of other compounds which are encompassed by the claims, therefore undue experimentation would be expected.

Due to the level of unpredictability in the art, the very limited guidance provided, and the lack of working examples, the applicant has shown lack of enablement. MPEP 2164.01(a) states, "A conclusion of lack of enablement means that, based on the evidence regarding each of the above factors, the specification, at the time the application was filed, would not have taught one skilled in the art how to make and/or use the full scope of the claimed invention without undue experimentation. *In re Wright*, 999 F.2d 1557, 1562, 27 USPQ2d 1510, 1513 (Fed. Cir. 1993)." That conclusion is clearly justified here.

Art Unit: 1624

Conclusion

No claims are allowed.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to BRIAN MCDOWELL whose telephone number is (571)270-5755. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday 8:30-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mr. James O. Wilson can be reached 571-272-0661. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/B. M./

Examiner, Art Unit 1624

/James O. Wilson/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1624

